

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 5, 2004. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31 and 36, the independent claims, and Claim 19, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. The changes made are to clarify what is already being claimed. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to the drawings; formal drawings incorporating the changes presented with Applicant's last Amendment, and now approved by the Examiner, are in preparation and will be submitted shortly.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,767,890 (Glasser et al.), and Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30, 33-35 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Glasser* in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,457 (Nakai et al.).

The present invention is directed to simple authentication processing for use in a case in which one image processing service, such as printing, is executed by a plurality of image processing apparatuses in combination. This invention is especially useful in cases where image data obtained by scanning an original document at a first image processing apparatus is printed at a second image processing apparatus, for example.

Independent Claim 1 states explicitly that the image processing apparatus performs an *image processing* service provided by a first operating instruction about image processing and a second operating instruction about image processing in cooperation with a different apparatus.

In an apparatus constructed according to Claim 1, input means allow the user of the first image processing apparatus to enter user information and the first operating instruction for the second apparatus, and first authentication means determine whether the first operating instruction is authorized for the user based on registered information and the user information. If the authentication result is positive, transmission means transmit to the second apparatus the second operating instruction and the user information, and second authentication means determine whether the second operating instruction is authorized for the user on the second apparatus based on information from the second apparatus. Determination means determine whether the user is to be permitted to use the image processing service based on the authentication result by the second authentication means. Claim 6 is directed to the second image processing apparatus, and Claim 11 to a system comprising the first and second image processing apparatuses.

Glasser relates to techniques for permitting a secure network server to be added to an existing network, such that the new server can be accessed by a client on the network, while

maintaining security. The client seeking access to the added server is authenticated for access, by the passing of authentication requests to an authenticating agent that has a database of authentication credentials. Based on appropriate responses from the agent, the client may be granted access, and database services are provided to the client based on database requests from the client.

Applicant submits, however, that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Glasser* that would teach or suggest any arrangement that performs an image processing service provided by a first operating instruction about image processing and a second operating instruction about image processing in cooperation with a different image processing apparatus accessible across a network, as recited in Claim 1. For at least that reason, it is submitted that Claim 1 is clearly allowable over *Glasser*.

Nakai is cited in the Office Action as disclosing scanners and printers, in a system in which operating instructions allow one device to utilize another across the network. Even if *Nakai* is assumed to show all that it is cited for, however, that would not supply what is missing from *Glasser* as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claim 6 is directed to an image processing apparatus that performs an image processing service provided by a first operating instruction and a second operating instruction about image processing in cooperation with a different image processing apparatus

accessible across a network. The apparatus comprises registration means for registering, in advance, predetermined registration information for a user who is permitted to use the apparatus. Reception means receive user information and the second operating instruction for the apparatus, both of which are entered by the user at the different apparatus on the network. Authentication means employ the predetermined registration information registered by the registration means and the user information received by the reception means to determine whether the user is an authorized user, and the second operating instruction is received after the first operating instruction is authenticated to be performed on the different apparatus. Determination means employ results obtained by the authentication means to determine whether the second operating instruction received by the reception means is to be accepted.

Claim 6 is deemed clearly allowable over the patents discussed above for the same reasons as is Claim 1.

Each of the other independent claims is believed to be allowable over *Glasser*, taken alone or in any permissible combination (if any exists) with *Nakai*, for at least the reasons advanced above with regard to Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "L.P. Diana", is written over a horizontal line.

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 443555v1